of the enzyme and not the concentration; as such, these claims are considered to find support in the specification.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 7-9, 12, 13, 15-19, 21, 22, 29-31, and 33-59 as being indefinite. The Examiner has noted his question as to the language leading to indefiniteness in each claim. Applicant has amended each of these claims to correct and place the claim in acceptable status under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 7-9, 13, 16-19, and 21 have been rejected as unpatentable over the Showa Denko European reference in view of Koohmaraie. Applicant believes the Examiner to be in error on this rejection noting that Koohmaraie may not be combined with Showa Denko since to do so would falsify the result of Showa Denko's measurement and thus destroy Showa Denko's invention. Showa Denko (equivalent to U.S. Patent No. 5,654,152) teaches an enzyme activity measuring apparatus which divides the originally mixed sample into different portions to make it easier to measure the activity of the enzymes of interest. Then, Showa Denko adds inhibitors to block the activity of unwanted enzymes in the sample, but never removes the inhibitors from the sample. In contrast, Koohmaraie does not divide the sample into different portions - the sample is eluted as a whole. Specific inhibitors now chemically bound to the enzymes, which themselves are bound to the column materials, stay on the column. Those enzymes not bound by inhibitors are eluted in the sample and measured. Thus, to combine Koohmaraie with the Showa Denko reference would require Showa Denko's procedure to be changed so that it does not measure all of the sample and thus would result in an erroneous

result. As a result, Showa Denko should not be combined with the procedure of Koohmaraie in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify Showa Denko's system to perform the method of Koohmaraie, and claims 7-9, 13, 16-19 and 21 should be patentable.

Claims 32 and 60-69 are stated to be directed to an invention distinct from that originally examined. The Examiner states it is unrelated, as not being capable of use together. Applicant notes that claim 32 involves the same device as claim 7, 29, 30 and 31; only the analyte changes. Thus, the inventions are related and should be examined.

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By
Gerald T. Shekleton
Registration No. 27,466

Dated: September 25, 1998

Welsh & Katz, Ltd.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/655-1500